

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 5-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Fiatal et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0157947, hereinafter Fiatal). Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fiatal in view of Conneely et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0050046, hereinafter Conneely).

### CLAIMS 1-11, 13 AND 14

Independent claim 1 provides a method of determining whether to establish a synchronization connection on a mobile device. Under the method, a determination is made that there is data on a computing device to be synchronized with data on a mobile device. A notification is broadcasted indicating that there is data to be synchronized using a one-way communication channel. The notification comprises a globally unique identifier for a container. The notification is received at the mobile device and based in part on the notification, the mobile device decides whether to initiate a connection to a computing device for the purpose of synchronization. This decision is made by comparing the globally unique identifier to globally unique identifiers of containers stored on the mobile device and by comparing the globally unique identifier to globally unique identifiers in previous notifications.

The amendments to claim 1 find support in the specification on page 20, lines 3-14 and page 21, line 33 to page 22, line 9.

Neither Fiatal nor Conneely show or suggest the invention of claim 1, because neither reference decides whether to initiate a connection for the purpose of synchronization by comparing a globally unique identifier in a notification to globally unique identifiers of containers stored on a mobile device and by comparing the globally unique identifier to globally unique identifiers in previous notifications. In fact, neither reference shows or suggests using globally unique identifiers for a container.

Since neither reference shows or suggests comparing a globally unique identifier in a notification to globally unique identifiers of containers stored on a mobile device and to globally unique identifiers in previous notifications, the combination of these two references does not show

or suggest the invention of claim 1 or claims 2-11, 13 and 14 which depend therefrom.

#### CLAIMS 15-23

Claim 15 provides a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing a series of steps. The steps include receiving a notification message along a one-way channel on a mobile device indicating that there has been a synchronization event on a computing device. Determining that more than a minimum number of notification messages have been received before establishing a connection wherein the minimum number is greater than one. A connection is then established along a two-way channel between the mobile device and the computing device based on the notification message. Data is then synchronized between the mobile device and the computing device through the two-way channel.

With the present amendment, the limitation of claim 24 has been added to claim 15 and claim 24 has been canceled. As amended, claim 15 is not shown or suggested in *Fiatal* or *Conneely*. In particular, neither reference shows or suggests determining whether more than a minimum number of notification messages have been received at a mobile device before establishing a connection along a two-way communication channel, wherein the minimum number is greater than one.

In the Office Action, this limitation was said to be shown in *Fiatal* in paragraph [0064]. Applicants respectfully dispute this assertion.

In paragraph [0064], *Fiatal* describes filters 138 that are configured on a personal client 40 to identify the types of e-mails or other types of events that cause "mobile device 21" to send a trigger 132. Although paragraph [0064] states that mobile device 21 sends trigger 132, this is clearly a typographical error since in FIG. 6, trigger 132 is clearly shown as being sent by personal client 40 and not by mobile device 21. Further, filters 138 are located on PC 38 and not on mobile device 21. As such, filters 138 identify types of e-mails and other types of events that cause personal client 40 to send a trigger 132, not mobile device 21.

Further, the cited paragraph does not show or suggest that a determination should be made as to whether more than a minimum number of notification messages have been received at a

mobile device before establishing a connection. Instead, Fiatal indicates that as soon as the mobile device receives a single notification message, it establishes a connection to management server 28 to request synchronization. Specifically, paragraph [0068] of Fiatal indicates that mobile device 21 initiates a mobile connection with management server 28 whenever it receives SMS messages having particular computer readable content.

This is substantially different from the invention of claim 15 in which a determination is made as to whether more than a minimum number of notification messages have been received at the mobile device before establishing a connection. By waiting for more than the minimum number of notifications to be received, the mobile device of claim 15 reduces the number of two-way channel connections that must be made to synchronize data thereby prolonging battery life in the mobile device and conserving communication bandwidth.

Since the combination of Fiatal and Conneely does not show or suggest determining whether more than a minimum number of notifications messages have been received at a mobile device before establishing a connection along a two-way communication channel, wherein the minimum numbers is greater than one, the combination of these two references does not show or suggest the invention of claim 15 or claims 16-23 which depend therefrom.


#### CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, claims 1-11 and 13-23 are in form for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By:   
Theodore M. Magee, Reg. No. 39,758  
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319  
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

TMM:sew